

THE MIDDLEBURY CAMPUS
Middlebury College
25 March 1983

Community Council Adopts C.I.A. Guidelines

By Richard Belanger

The Community Council meeting on March 17 again took up the question of intelligence agencies on campus. After much discussion, the council adopted guidelines for intelligence agency interviews on campus, and formulated a resolution concerning faculty, student and staff connections with intelligence agencies, for the faculty to vote on.

The council adopted the following proposal on a vote of 7-0: 1) The Career Counseling and Placement office (CC&P) must be informed 10 days in advance, whenever possible, about career informational meetings. 2) All career informational meetings must be open and set up and run in conformity with CC&P guidelines and publicized outside of the CC&P office. 3) Special meetings for those who have obtained interviews through the bidding system need only be advertised at the CC&P office, but such meetings must be open.

The proposal would ensure that all meetings will be open to the public, while still trying to preserve the pre-interview meetings as a resource primarily for interviewees.

A resolution was made, after much debate, which will be distributed to the faculty and be voted upon at the next Community Council meeting. The resolution reads as follows: "Surveillance on the college campus by domestic or foreign intelligence agencies is inconsistent with the educational purpose of Mid-

dlebury College and should not occur on campus. Faculty, staff, or students should not provide information to intelligence agency recruiters on other faculty, staff, or students without the prior permission of the person concerned."

After deciding to delay a final vote on that proposal, the Council adjourned. Steven Rockefeller, dean of the College, later said he felt "it has been a useful series of meetings on a complex and sensitive issue."

The meeting had begun with a discussion of the meeting between representatives of the N.S.A. and College Russian students. Rockefeller said that there appeared to be "nothing wrong with that type of meeting... but it should have taken place in a public space." Sophomore Andrea Wallenberger, a Russian major and president of the Russian club, said she believed that the meeting had been "mis-represented. No one who was there has had a chance to speak."

Sophomore Mike Neely, a Russian major present at the meeting, gave the following account of what occurred: "People perceived that the N.S.A. said it would be possible to work for it during junior and senior years... They actually proposed an intense Russian language school at the NSA for one summer, a return to college for fall semester, and then to work spring semester as a paid employee of the N.S.A., return and finish college, and then, if you were still interested, you

could then go to work full-time for the N.S.A. He did not clarify whether this would interfere with going abroad junior year."

Junior Bill Shackelford, chairman of the Community Council, asked whether foreign students were asked to leave this N.S.A. informational session. Neely responded that "they didn't ask anybody to leave, he merely paused after asking if everyone present was an American citizen." Kitty Calavita, assistant professor of sociology-anthropology, asked, "Didn't that pause mean that they (the foreign students) should leave?" Neely answered, "The pause was long enough so that it was easy to interpret that he meant for the foreign students to leave."

Senior Steve Wishengrad, member of the Committee Concerned About Intelligence Recruiting, expressed concern that the meeting was not arranged through Career Counseling and Placement (CC&P), and that he "would prefer it (such a meeting) publicized so that the entire College community could come, rather than just a few invited people." Wishengrad then proposed that all meetings should be coordinated through CC&P.

Rockefeller said, "CC&P people don't necessarily have to organize it. Faculty or students could invite speakers."

The council then considered the second major question of the day: that of faculty, staff, or students employed by intelligence agencies for either

CONTINUED

2.

overt or covert operations. David Rosenberg, associate professor of political science and a member of the Community Council, reported that there are "C.I.A. employed faculty" ranging from spotters to researchers. He said he knows of "no surveillance on campus, but (I am) concerned about the presence of the C.I.A. and its effect on freedom of speech... people's rights are violated by the chilling effect of the C.I.A."

Senior Grier Taylor-Weeks, a member of the Committee Concerned About Intelligence Recruiting, concurred with Rosenberg, saying that "many students are afraid" of the C.I.A. Rockefeller expressed concern that we "must make a distinction between security checks and surveillance work."

Rockefeller said he believed that "if the president knew of people actively involved in surveillance ... he would discourage ... them. Surveillance is inimical to the freedom of campus." After further discussion, Taylor-Weeks proposed a survey of all faculty to see how many had been approached by the C.I.A. to be spotters.

Rosenberg said he did not "think that it (the problem of intelligence agencies on campus) could be dealt with by surveys and resolutions. Maybe we ought to have demonstrations." Calavita said that "surveys and demonstrations are not mutually exclusive." Other members of the council said they felt a bit reluctant to go ahead with a survey, but senior Ted Truscott, chairman of the Student Forum, offered to draw one up for approval.